



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

70
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,162	01/14/2002	Chiung-Hwa Liu	67,200-635	4351
7590	05/20/2004		EXAMINER	CHEN, TE Y
TUNG & ASSOCIATES Suite 120 838 W. Long Lake Road Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER 2171 3
DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/047,162	LIU, CHIUNG-HWA	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Susan Y Chen	2171		

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

Claims 1-12 are pending for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on 1/14/2002 complies with the revisions of 37 CFR 1.97 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file. The information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits. (see attached PTO-1449 form).

Specification

It is noted that the present specification does not contain line numbers. For ease of reference by both Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the line numbering. A recommend format for numbering the claims is to number each line of each claim with a new starting line number. Also, the specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicants may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,799).

As to claim 1, Robertson et al. (hereinafter referred as Robertson) discloses a micro-electronic fabrication system as claimed by applicant [e.g., Fig(s) 1-2], comprising:

A microelectronic fabrication facility information system comprising: a series of databases [e.g., 208, 209, 235, 238, 242, 246 and 250, Fig. 2] having contained therein production information for microelectronic fabrication product orders within a microelectronic fabrication facility [e.g., Abstract, lines 1-10, col. 8, lines 36-60]; and a microelectronic fabrication facility communication interface [e.g., the Internet (230, Fig. 2)] connected to the series of databases, where the microelectronic fabrication facility communication interface serves as an interface to a distributed communication network and functions in a fashion which allows a microelectronic fabrication customer also

connected to the distributed communications network to access the information within the series of databases [e.g., col. 8, line 61 – col. 9, line 3].

As to claim 3, except all the features recited in claim 1, Robertson further discloses that the microelectronic fabrication facility communication interface is a computer server [e.g., 260, 232, Fig. 2 and associated texts].

As to claim 4, except all the features recited in claim 3, Robertson further discloses that the computer server has incorporated therein the series of databases [e.g., 235, 238, 242, 246 and 250, Fig. 2].

As to claims 5-6, except all the features recited in claim 1, Robertson further discloses that the distributed communications network is selected from the group consisting of local area networks, wide area networks, Internet networks and intranet networks [Note: the cited limitations are read by the Internet communication (230, Fig. 2)].

As to claim 7, 9-12, these claims recited the same features as claims 1 and 3-6 in form of computer method, hence are rejected for the same reason.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,799).

As to claim 2, Robertson discloses all the features recited in claim 1, except he fails to teach that the system is incorporated into a microelectronic fabrication facility selected from the group consisting of integrated circuit microelectronic fabrication facilities, ceramic substrate microelectronic fabrication facilities, solar cell optoelectronic microelectronic fabrication facilities, sensor image array optoelectronic microelectronic facilities and display image array optoelectronic microelectronic fabrication facilities.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of selecting a microelectronic fabrication facility from the group of integrated circuit, ceramic substrate, solar cell, sensor image and display image array microelectronic fabrication facilities is well known and expected in the semiconductor art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to select the microelectronic fabrication facility from the compound

components as claimed, because all those components are the basic widget to construct a semiconductor part and by selecting those needed components would facilitate a semiconductor customizing processing.

As to claim 8, this claim recited the same limitations as claim 2 in form of method, hence is rejected for the same reason.

Conclusion

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: 1) Rogers et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,604,135) disclosed an application program interface to fulfills requests from a browser in a distributed integration client/server environment; 2) Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6,706,234) disclosed a direct write method for polarized materials.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y Chen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (703) 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Y Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2171

May 16, 2004



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER